arXiv:1210.4479v1 [math.LO] 16 Oct 2012

Invariant types in dp-minimal theories

Pierre Simon

October 17, 2012

Abstract

We try to analyse general invariant types in dp-minimal theories in terms of finitely satisfiable and definable ones. We prove in particular that an invariant dp-minimal type is either finitely satisfiable or definable and that a definable version of the (p,q)-theorem holds in dp-minimal theories of small or medium directionality. In an Appendix with Sergei Starchenko, we prove that in dp-minimal theories with Skolem functions, every non-forking formula extends to a definable type.

1 Introduction

Assume that T is NIP. In [She10], Shelah proves that given an arbitrary type p over some saturated M and $a \models p$, one can find some small $c \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathrm{tp}(c/M)$ is finitely satisfiable and $\mathrm{tp}(a/cM)$ is weakly orthogonal to all types finitely satisfiable in M. Thus one can consider c as a maximal analysis of p over finitely satisfiable types. The initial idea of the present paper is to consider what happens when p is taken to be invariant. It is an easy observation that if p is orthogonal to all finitely satisfiable types (*i.e.*, we cannot do any analysis), then it must be definable (see Lemma 5). This gave rise to the hope of being able to analyse any invariant type over finitely satisfiable types, with a definable 'quotient'. However, this ended up being harder than expected and the main questions are left unresolved (see the last section for some open problems). We only manage to treat the dimension one case, where no mixed situation can occur. Thus our first main theorem is the following:

Theorem 1. *If p is an invariant type of dp-rank 1, then it is either finitely satisfiable or definable.*

In turned out that those ideas were useful in studying another related problem: that of finding definable (or partially definable) types. If $p(x)$ is a global M-invariant type, then for any formula $\phi(x;y)$, we can consider the subset $d_p\phi \subseteq S_y(M)$ of types $q(y)$ such that $p \vdash \phi(x;b)$ for any $b \models q$. The type p is definable exactly when the sets $d_p\phi$ are open for all ϕ (and hence they are also closed). We are concerned here with finding types extending some given formula and for which some prescribed type q falls in the interior of $d_p\phi$. We only succeed under strong assumptions on the theory.

Theorem 2. *Assume that T is dp-minimal and of medium or small directionality, then given any model M and formula $\phi(x;b) \in L(\mathfrak{U})$, if $\phi(x;b)$ does not fork over M, then there is a formula $\theta(y) \in \mathrm{tp}(b/M)$ such that $\bigwedge_{b' \in \theta(\mathfrak{U})} \phi(x;b')$ is consistent (and hence does not fork over M).*

That this holds in any NIP theory was conjectured in [CS12a]. This conjecture amounts to asking for a definable version of the (p,q)-theorem of finite combinatorics, as we explain below.

The last section contains some results concerning amalgamation of invariant types. It is independent of the rest of the paper. As an application, we show that if $(p_i(x_i) : i < \alpha)$ is a family of pairwise orthogonal invariant types, then $\bigcup_{i<\alpha} p_i(x_i)$ is a complete type.

In an appendix, written jointly with Sergei Starchenko, we show that one can adapt the constructions given here to find definable types in dp-minimal theories with definable Skolem functions. In this context, we show the existence of a definable type extending any non-forking formula. In particular, this holds for $\mathbb{Q}_p$, which we believe was not known before.

Acknowledgements Thanks to Sergei Starchenko for motivating me to work on Conjecture 3 and agreeing to include Theorem 31 here. Thanks also to Itay Kaplan for reading some previous versions of this paper.

2 Setting and basic facts

Throughout, T is a complete *countable* theory, which we do not assume to be NIP and $\mathfrak{U}$ is a monster model. We write $M \prec^+ N$ to mean $M \prec N$ and N is $|M|^+$-saturated.

The notation ϕ^0 means $\neg\phi$ and ϕ^1 means ϕ.

If $M \prec^+ N$ and $p \in S(N)$, then p is M-invariant if for any $b, b' \in N$ and any formula $\phi(x;y)$, $b \equiv_M b'$ implies $p \vdash \phi(x;b) \leftrightarrow \phi(x;b')$. If N is not specified, we mean $N = \mathcal{U}$. If M is omitted, we mean "for some M such that $M \prec^+ N$". Any M-invariant type over N extends in a unique way to a global M-invariant type. Thus there is no harm in considering only global invariant types.

As usual, we say that two types $p, q \in S(N)$ are *weakly orthogonal* if $p(x) \cup q(y)$ defines a complete type in two variables over N. If p and q are M-invariant types, we say they are *orthogonal* if they are weakly orthogonal as global types. Note that this implies that $p|_N$ and $q|_N$ are weakly orthogonal for any N such that $M \prec^+ N$.

An important notion in this work is that of commuting types. If p_x and q_y are two global invariant types, then $p_x \otimes q_y$ denotes $\mathrm{tp}(a, b/\mathcal{U})$ where $b \models q$ and $a \models p|\mathcal{U}b$. We say that p and q *commute* if $p_x \otimes q_y = q_y \otimes p_x$. We say that p and q commute over M_1 if $p_x \otimes q_y|_{M_1} = q_y \otimes p_x|_{M_1}$. Note that by associativity of $\otimes$, if p and q commute, then p commutes with $q^{(n)} = q \otimes \cdots \otimes q$.

The following observation will be used frequently: Assume that p and q are M-invariant global types. Let $M \prec^+ N$. Build successively $b \models q|_N$, $a \models p|_{Nb}$ and I a Morley sequence of q over Nab. Then the sequence $b+I$ is indiscernible over Na if and only if p and q commute.

Of course, if p and q are orthogonal, then they commute. In NIP theories, we can consider commuting as a kind of weak form of orthogonality. This may seem exaggerated since for example a type may commute with itself, but it turns out to be a useful intuition. It is also motivated by the study of distal theories (see [Sim11a]) where in fact the two notions coincide (and this can be taken as a definition of distal theories amongst NIP theories).

Recall that, in an NIP theory, a global invariant type p is *generically stable* if it is definable and finitely satisifiable. This is equivalent to saying that p commutes with itself: $p(x_1) \otimes p(x_2) = p(x_2) \otimes p(x_1)$.

We recall also the notion of strict non-forking from [CK12]. Let M be a model of an NIP theory. A sequence $(b_i)_{i<\omega}$ is strictly non-forking over M if for each $i < \omega$, $\mathrm{tp}(b_i/b_{<i}M)$ is strictly non-forking over M which means that it extends to a global type $\mathrm{tp}(b_*/\mathcal{U})$ such that both $\mathrm{tp}(b_*/\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathrm{tp}(\mathcal{U}/Mb_*)$ are non-forking over M. We will only need to know two facts about strict non-forking sequences:

(Existence) Given $b \in \mathcal{U}$ and $M \models T$, there is a sequence $b = b_0, b_1, \ldots$ which is strictly non-forking over M. We might call such a sequence a *strict Morley sequence* of $\mathrm{tp}(b/M)$.

(Witnessing property) If the formula $\phi(x; b)$ forks over M, then for any strictly non-forking sequence $b = b_0, b_1, \ldots$, the type $\{\phi(x; b_i) : i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent.

If $\phi(x; y)$ is an NIP formula, we let $\mathrm{alt}(\phi)$ be the *alternation number* of ϕ, namely the maximal n for which there is an indiscernible sequence $(b_i : i < \omega)$ and a tuple a with $\neg(\phi(a; b_i) \leftrightarrow \phi(a; b_{i+1}))$ for all $i < n$. If $(b_i : i < \omega)$ is indiscernible and $\{\phi(x; b_i) : i < \mathrm{alt}(\phi)/2 + 1\}$ is consistent, then $\{\phi(x; b_i) : i < \omega\}$ is also consistent.

We are interested in the following conjecture which first appeared in [CS12a].

Conjecture 3. *Let* T *be NIP and* $M \models T$. *Let* $\phi(x; d) \in L(\mathcal{U})$ *a formula, non-forking over* M. *Then there is* $\theta(y) \in \mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ *such that the partial type* $\{\phi(x; d') : d' \in \theta(\mathcal{U})\}$ *is consistent.*

First, a few basic observations:

– As $\phi(x; d)$ does not fork over M, it extends to some M-invariant type p. (Recall that in NIP theories, non-forking and invariance are the same over models.)

– If p is finitely satisfiable, then in particular, $\phi(x; d)$ has a solution a in M. Then we can take $\theta(y) = \phi(a; y)$. In this case, the formula $\phi(x; d)$ also extends to the definable type $x = a$.

– If p is definable, then we may take $\theta(y)$ to be the ϕ-definition of p.

Hence, the interesting case is when p is neither definable nor finitely satisfiable. This is where the ideas mentioned in the introduction become useful.

The (p, q)-theorem

We note that this conjecture can be seen as a definable version of the (p, q)-theorem from finite combinatorics. First, we recall the statement in model-theoretic terminology.

Theorem 4. *Let* $\phi(x; y)$ *be an NIP formula. Let* $k < \omega$, *then there are two integers* q *and* n *such that for every finite* $Y \subset M^{|y|}$, *if for every* $Y_0 \subseteq Y$ *of size* $\leq q$, *we can find* a *such that* $Y_0 \subseteq \phi(a; M)$, *then there are* $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ *such that* $Y \subseteq \bigcup_{i<N} \phi(a_i; Y)$.

This statement is actually weaker than the original (p, q)-theorem which allows one to choose the integer q. See [Sim, Chapter 6] for more details and for a proof. This theorem was used in [CS12a] to prove uniformity of honest definitions. We refer the reader to [Mat04] for the original proof.

Let T be NIP and $M \models T$. Assume that $\phi(x;d) \in L(\mathcal{U})$ does not fork over M. By lowness (see [Sim, Proposition 5.38]), there is $\psi(y)$ in $L(M)$ such that for any $d' \models \psi(y)$, the formula $\phi(x;d')$ does not fork over M. Let $Y \subseteq S_y(M)$ be the set of types containing the formula $\psi(y)$. As noted in [CS12a, Proposition 25], the (p,q)-theorem implies that we can partition Y into finitely many sets $Y_0, \ldots, Y_{n-1}$ such that for each $i < n$, $\{\phi(x;d') : d' \in \mathcal{U}, \mathrm{tp}(d'/M) \in Y_k\}$ is consistent (and thus does not fork over M).

Conjecture 3 and compactness imply that we can choose the sets Y_k to be clopens. In fact, the converse is also true: if we can choose the Y_k's to be definable, then the conjecture follows since $\mathrm{tp}(b/M)$ must lie in one of them.

Finally, note that it is enough to prove the conjecture when M is countable (assuming T is countable), because we can always find a countable submodel over which $\phi(x;d)$ does not fork.

3 Recognising definable types

The following lemma holds in any theory and is the key to identifying definable types.

Lemma 5. *Let* p *be an invariant type. Then* p *is definable if and only if it commutes with every finitely satisfiable type.*

Proof. We know that a finitely satisfiable type and a definable one commute (see [Sim, Lemma 2.23]). We show the converse. Assume that $p(x)$ is M-invariant. If p is not definable, then there is a formula $\phi(x;y)$ such that the set $D_\phi(p) = \{q \in S_y(M) : p \vdash \phi(x;b)$ for some (any) $b \models q\}$ is not closed. Then there is an ultrafilter $\mathcal{F}$ on $D_\phi(p)$ which converges to a type outside of it. For every $q \in D_\phi(p)$, let $a_q \in \mathcal{U}$ realise q and denote by $r(y)$ the limit type $\lim_{\mathcal{F}} \mathrm{tp}(a_q/\mathcal{U})$. Then for $\mathcal{F}$-every q, we have $p \vdash \phi(x;a_q)$, hence $r \otimes p \vdash \phi(x;y)$. However, $r|_M = \lim(\mathcal{F})$ is outside of $D_\phi(p)$ by hypothesis which implies that $p \otimes r \vdash \neg\phi(x;y)$. So p and r do not commute. ☐

We state a strengthening of that lemma which will also be needed.

Lemma 6. *Let* p *be an* M*-invariant type. Assume that for every type* q*, finitely satisfiable in* M *we have* $p \otimes q|_M = q \otimes p|_M$*, then* p *is definable.*

Proof. Let p as in the statement. First we show that p is an heir of its restriction to M. Assume that this is not the case. Then there is $\phi(x;y) \in L(M)$

and $d \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $p \vdash \phi(x; d)$ and for all $b \in M$, $p \vdash \neg\phi(x; b)$. Let q be any global coheir of $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$. Then $p_x \otimes q_y \vdash \phi(x; y)$ by construction, but necessarily, $q_y \otimes p_x \vdash \neg\phi(x; y)$. This contradicts the hypothesis.

Assume that we can find a formula $\phi(x; y) \in L(M)$ and $q \in S_y(M)$ such that q has two global coheirs q_0, q_1 such that $q_l \otimes p \vdash \phi(x; y)^l$. Then p cannot commute with both q_0 and q_1 (over M), contradicting the hypothesis. Fix a formula $\phi(x; y)$. For $l \in \{0, 1\}$, define $X_l \subseteq M$ as $\{a \in M : p \vdash \phi(x; a)\}$. Take some $q \in S(M)$. Define $\mathcal{F}_q$ to be the filter on $M^{|y|}$ containing the sets $\theta(M)$ for $\theta(y) \in q$. For some $l = l(q) \in \{0, 1\}$, we cannot find q_l as above. This means that we cannot extend $\mathcal{F}_q \cup \{X_l\}$ to an ultrafilter on M. Therefore there is $\theta_q(y) \in q$ such that $\theta_q(M) \cap X_0 = \emptyset$.

By compactness on $S_y(M)$, we can find two formulas $\theta_0(y), \theta_1(y)$ which cover $S_y(M)$ and such that $\theta_l(M) \cap X_l = \emptyset$. We see that for $a \in M^{|y|}$, we have $p \vdash \phi^l(x; a) \iff a \models \theta_l(y)$, thus $p|_M$ is definable. As p in an heir of $p|_M$ it is also definable. ☐

In the study of the dp-minimal case, we will work by induction on the number of variables. Hence the following will be useful.

Lemma 7. *Let T be NIP. Let $\phi(x, y; d) \in L(\mathcal{U})$ and $M \models T$ such that $\phi(x, y; d)$ does not fork over M. Assume that there $(a, b) \models \phi(x, y; d)$, $\mathrm{tp}(a, b/\mathcal{U})$ is M-invariant and $\mathrm{tp}(b/\mathcal{U})$ is finitely satisfiable in M. Then there is $b_0 \in M$ such that $\phi(x; b_0, d)$ does not fork over M.*

Proof. Let $(d_i : i < \omega)$ be a strict Morley sequence of $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$. Let n be larger than the alternation number of $\phi(x; y)$. The tuple b satisfies the formula $(\exists x) \bigwedge_{k<n} \phi(x, y; d_k)$. Therefore there is $b_0 \in M$ satisfying the same formula. We claim that $\phi(x; b_0, d)$ does not fork over M. Indeed, there is a' such that $\bigwedge_{k<n} \phi(x; b_0, d_k)$ holds. By hypothesis on n, this implies that the type $\{\phi(x; b_0, d_i) : i < \omega\}$ is consistent and therefore $\phi(x; b_0, d)$ does not fork over M. ☐

Corollary 8. *Assume that T is NIP. If all invariant 1-types are finitely satisfiable, then all invariant types are.*

Now to show Conjecture 3 by induction it would be enough to consider the case where for every M-invariant type extending $\phi(\bar{x}; d)$ none of the induced one-types are finitely satisfiable.

4 One variable

Our first theorem is stated for a type of dp-rank 1 in an arbitrary theory. Dependent types in a possibly independent theory are presented for example in [KSb]. We will only need to consider the case of finite dp-rank. So let us recall:

Definition 9. Let p be a partial type over some set A. Then p is of dp-rank $\leq n$ if for any $a \models p$ and any n sequences $I_0, \ldots, I_{n-1}$ mutually indiscernible over A, then there is $k < n$ such that I_k is indiscernible over Aa.

One can check that this definition does not depend on the choice of A.

A theory T is *dp-minimal* if all 1-types have dp-rank 1. This implies that T is NIP.

Theorem 10. *(T any theory) Let p be a global invariant type of dp-rank 1. Then p is either finitely satisfiable or definable.*

Proof. Assume that p is not definable. Then there is a global type q finitely satisfiable in some M such that p does not commute with q. Without loss, p is also invariant over M. Let $\phi(x; d) \in p$. Take $N \succ M$, sufficiently saturated.

Let $(a, b) \models p \otimes q|_N$, then let I be a Morley sequence of q over Nab and let $\bar{b} = b + I$. The sequence $\bar{b}$ is indiscernible over N, but not over Na. Let $M \prec^+ N_1 \prec^+ N$ and tp(N_1/Md) is finitely satisfiable in M.

Claim: tp$(a/\bar{b}N_1) \vdash$ tp$_\phi(a/N)$.

Let $r \in S_y(N\bar{b})$ be finitely satisfiable in N. Let r' be any global extension of r to a type finitely satisfiable in N. Let $l = l(r) \in \{0, 1\}$ be such that $r' \models \phi^l(a; y)$.

Assume that we can find $c \models r$ such that $\models \phi^{1-l}(a; c)$. Then let J be a Morley sequence of r' over everything and $\bar{c} = c + J$. The sequences $\bar{b}$ and $\bar{c}$ are mutually indiscernible over N and none of them is indiscernible over Na. This contradicts dp-rank 1. Thus by compactness, there are $\theta_r(y) \in r$ and $\psi_r(x) \in$ tp$(a/N\bar{b})$ such that $\models \theta_r(y) \wedge \psi_r(x) \to \phi^l(x; y)$.

Let $S \subset S_y(N\bar{b})$ be the set of types finitely satisfiable in N. It is a closed set, thus compact. We can therefore extract from the family $\{\theta_r(y) : r \in S\}$ a finite subcover $\{\theta_r(x) : r \in S^*\}$. For $l = 0, 1$, let $S^*_l = \{r \in S^* : l(r) = l\}$ and define $\theta_l(y) = \bigwedge_{r \in S^*_l} \theta_r(y)$. Also define $\psi_l(x) = \bigwedge_{r \in S^*_l} \psi_r(x)$.

Then θ_0, θ_1 cover S, in particular, $\theta_0(N) \cup \theta_1(N) = N^{|y|}$. Also $\psi_l(x) \in$ tp$(a/N\bar{b})$ and $\models \theta_l(y) \wedge \psi_l(x) \to \phi^l(x; y)$.

Write $\theta_l(y) = \theta_l(y; \bar{b}, e)$ and $\psi_l(x) = \psi_l(x; \bar{b}, e)$ with $e \in N$. As tp$(a, \bar{b}/N)$ is M-invariant, we may replace e by any $e' \equiv_M e$. In particular, we may assume that $e \in N_1$. The claim follows.

Let $\psi_l(x; \bar{b}, e), \theta_l(y; \bar{b}, e)$ be as in the proof of the claim. Then $\theta_1(d; \bar{b}, e)$ holds. As tp$(\bar{b}/N)$ is finitely satisfiable in M, there is $\bar{b}_0 \in M$ such that

$$\bar{b}_0 \models \theta_1(d; \bar{z}, e) \wedge (\exists x)(\forall y)(\theta_1(y; \bar{z}, e) \to \phi(x; y)).$$

There is therefore $a_0 \in N_1$ such that $\psi_1(a_0; \bar{b}_0, e)$ holds and then $a_0 \models \phi(x; d)$. As tp(N_1/Mb) is finitely satisfiable in M, we can find $a_0' \in M$ satisfying $\phi(x; d)$. Hence p is finitely satisfiable in M. ☐

Hence if T is dp-minimal, Conjecture 3 is proved for any formula $\phi(x; d)$, $|x| = 1$.

5 Two variables

In this section and the next one, we assume for simplicity that T is dp-minimal and try to deal with formulas in more than one variable.

The next proposition solves Conjecture 3 for formulas in two variables.

Proposition 11. *Assume that* T *is dp-minimal. Let* $\phi(x_1, x_2; d) \in L(\mathcal{U})$ *be non-forking over* M*;* $|x_1| = |x_2| = 1$*. Then there is* $\theta(y) \in$ tp(d/M) *such that* $\bigwedge_{d' \in \theta(\mathcal{U})} \phi(x_1, x_2; d')$ *is consistent.*

Proof. Fix some model $M \prec N$, N is very saturated and let $\phi(x_1, x_2; d) \in L(N)$ be non-forking over M. Let $a_1 \hat{\ } a_2 \models \phi(x_1, x_2; d)$ such that tp$(a_1, a_2/N)$ is non-forking over M. By Lemma 7, we may assume that $p_1 = $ tp(a_1/N) is not finitely satisfiable in M. Therefore it is definable and does not commute with itself. Also we may assume that $p = $ tp$(a_1, a_2/N)$ is not definable, therefore there is some type $q \in S(N)$ finitely satisfiable in M such that p does not commute with q.

Now let $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $(a_1 \hat{\ } a_2, c_2, c_1) \models p \otimes q \otimes p_1$. Let I be a Morley sequence of p_1 over everything and J a Morley sequence of p_2 over everything. Then the sequences $\bar{c}_1 = c_1 + I$ and $\bar{c}_2 = c_2 + J$ are mutually indiscernible over N (because the types p_1 and q commute). But neither of them is indiscernible over $N a_1 a_2$. As the dp-rank of $a_1 \hat{\ } a_2$ over N is 2 (by additivity of dp-rank, see [KOU12]), we can do the same reasoning as in the claim of Theorem 10. Namely, take some $M \prec^+ N_1 \prec^+ N$ and tp(N_1/Md) is finitely satisfiable in

M. Then we have $\mathrm{tp}(a_1\hat{}a_2/\bar{c}_1\bar{c}_2N_1) \vdash \mathrm{tp}_\phi(a_1\hat{}a_2/N)$ as witnessed by some $\psi_l(x;\bar{z}_1,\bar{z}_2,e)$, $\theta_l(y;\bar{z}_1,\bar{z}_2,e)$ with $e \in N_1$.

As $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_2/N\bar{c}_1)$ is finitely satisfiable in M, there is $\bar{c}_2' \in M$ such that:

$$\models \theta_1(d;\bar{c}_1,\bar{c}_2',e) \wedge (\exists x)(\forall y)(\theta_1(y;\bar{c}_1,\bar{c}_2',e) \to \phi(x;y)).$$

Let $\Theta(d;\bar{c}_1,\bar{c}_2',e)$ be this conjunction. As $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_1/N)$ is definable in M, there is a formula $d\Theta(y;\bar{z}_2,\bar{t}) \in L(M)$ such that for all $y,\bar{z}_2,\bar{t} \in N$, we have $d\Theta(y;\bar{z}_2,\bar{t}) \leftrightarrow \Theta(y;\bar{c}_1,\bar{z}_2,\bar{t})$. As $\mathrm{tp}(e/Md)$ is finitely satisfiable in M, we can find $e' \in M$ such that $d\Theta(d;\bar{c}_2',e')$ holds. Then unwinding, we see that the type $\{\phi(x;d') :\models d\Theta(d';\bar{c}_2',e')\}$ is consistent, as required. $\square$

6 More variables

The proof of the two-variable case relied on the fact that non-forking formulas in one variable extend to definable types. However the conclusion we obtain is weaker and this prevents us from going on to higher arities. In this section, we do our best to pursue nonetheless. We manage to make an induction go through, but with an even weaker property.

We start with a local version of a previous lemma.

Lemma 12. *Let* $M \prec^+ N$ *and let* $a \in \mathcal{U}$ *such that* $p = \mathrm{tp}(a/N)$ *is* M-*invariant. Let* $q \in S_y(M)$ *and* $b \in q(N)$. *The following are equivalent:*

(i) $p \otimes \tilde{q}|_M = \tilde{q} \otimes p|_M$ *for every global coheir* $\tilde{q}$ *of* q.

(ii) for every formula $\phi(x;y) \in L(M)$ *such that* $a \models \phi(x;b)$, *there is* $\theta(y) \in q$ *such that for any* $b' \in \theta(M)$, $a \models \phi(x;b')$.

Proof. (i) ⇒ (ii): Assume that (i) holds and let $\phi(x;y) \in L(M)$ such that $a \models \phi(x;b)$. Then (i) implies that there is no coheir $\tilde{q}$ of q such that $\tilde{q} \models \neg\phi(a;y)$. Hence as in Lemma 6, we can find a formula $\theta(y) \in q$ such that $\phi(a;b')$ holds for every $b' \in \theta(M)$.

(ii) ⇒ (i): Assume (ii). Let $\phi(x;y) \in L(M)$ such that $p \otimes q \vdash \phi(x;y)$ and $\theta(y) \in L(M)$ given by (ii). Let $\tilde{q}$ a global coheir of q, and we have to show that $\tilde{q} \vdash \phi(a;y)$. Assume not, then $\tilde{q} \vdash \neg\phi(a;y) \wedge \theta(y)$. But that formula is not realised in M. Contradiction. $\square$

Hence to solve Conjecture 3, it is enough to prove that given $M \prec^+ N$ and $\phi(x;d) \in L(N)$ non-forking over M, there is $a \in \phi(\mathcal{U};d)$, $\mathrm{tp}(a/N)$ does not fork over M and commutes over M with every coheir of $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$. (Because then, taking $\theta(y) \in \mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ as in point (ii) of the lemma, we have that $\{\phi(x; b') : b' \in \theta(\mathcal{U})\}$ is consistent.)

We will not succeed in finding such a type, instead we will obtain a weaker property.

Lemma 13. *Let* $M \prec M_1 \prec^+ N$ *and let* $a \in \mathcal{U}$ *such that* $p = \mathrm{tp}(a/N)$ *is* M*-invariant. Let* $q \in S_y(M)$ *and* $b \in q(N)$*. The following are equivalent:*

(i) $p \otimes \tilde{q}|_{M_1} = \tilde{q} \otimes p|_{M_1}$ *for every global coheir* $\tilde{q}$ *of* q *extending* $\mathrm{tp}(b/M_1)$*;*

(ii) for every formula $\phi(x; y) \in L(M_1)$ *such that* $a \models \phi(x; b)$*, there is* $\theta(y) \in \mathrm{tp}(b/M_1)$ *such that for any* $b' \in \theta(M)$*,* $a \models \phi(x; b')$*.*

Proof. We assume that $\mathrm{tp}(b/M_1)$ is finitely satisfiable in M, otherwise everything is trivial.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Assume that (i) holds and let $\phi(x; y) \in L(M_1)$ such that $a \models \phi(x; b)$. Then (i) implies that there is no global coheir $\tilde{q}$ of q extending $\mathrm{tp}(b/M_1)$ such that $\tilde{q} \models \neg\phi(a; y)$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\theta(M) : \theta(y) \in \mathrm{tp}(b/M_1)\}$. By the previous sentence, $\mathcal{F} \cup \{\neg\phi(a; M)\}$ cannot be extended to an ultrafilter on $M^{|y|}$. Hence there is $\theta(y) \in \mathrm{tp}(b/M_1)$ such that $\theta(M) \subseteq \phi(a; M)$, as required.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Assume (ii). Let $\phi(x; y) \in L(M_1)$ such that $p \otimes q \vdash \phi(x; y)$ and $\theta(y) \in L(M_1)$ given by (ii). Let $\tilde{q}$ a global coheir of q extending $\mathrm{tp}(b/M_1)$, and we have to show that $\tilde{q} \vdash \phi(a; y)$. Assume not, then $\tilde{q} \vdash \neg\phi(a; y) \wedge \theta(y)$. But that formula is not realised in M. Contradiction. □

We introduce the notion of "a_2-forking" as defined in Cotter & Starchenko's paper [CS12b]. For this, we assume that T is NIP.

Assume we have $M \prec^+ N$ and $a_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathrm{tp}(a_2/N)$ is M-invariant. We say that a formula $\psi(x, a_2; d) \in L(Na_2)$ a_2-divides over M if there is an M-indiscernible sequence $(d_i : i < \omega)$ inside N with $d_0 = d$ and $\{\psi(x, a_2; d_i) : i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent. We define a_2-forking in the natural way.

Fact 14. *Notations being as above, the following are equivalent:*

(i) $\psi(x, a_2; d)$ *does not* a_2*-divide over* M*;*

(ii) $\psi(x, a_2; d)$ *does not* a_2*-fork over* M*;*

(iii) if $(d_i : i < \omega)$ *is a strict Morley sequence of* $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ *inside* N*, then* $\{\psi(x, a_2; d_i) : i < \omega\}$ *is consistent;*

(iv) there is $a_1 \models \psi(x, a_2; d)$ *such that* $\mathrm{tp}(a_1, a_2/N)$ *is* M*-invariant.*

To prove this, notice that $\psi(x, a_2; d)$ a_2-divides (resp. forks) over M if and only if the partial type in two variables $\psi(x, y; d) \wedge \mathrm{tp}_y(a_2/N)$ divides (resp. forks) over M. As forking equals dividing over models, and dividing is witnessed by strict Morley sequences, we easily obtain all the equivalences. (Alternatively, one can adapt the proofs of the corresponding facts for usual forking, as done in the Appendix of [CS12b].)

Let $M \prec^+ N$, M is countable and $d \in N$. We can find $M \prec M_1 \prec N$ such that:

$\bullet_0$ M_1 is countable;

$\bullet_1$ $\mathrm{tp}(d/M_1)$ is finitely satisfiable in M;

$\bullet_2$ for every finite $m \in M_1$, there is $d' \in M_1$ such that $(m, d') \equiv_M (m, d)$;

$\bullet_3$ for every finite $m \in M_1$, there is a strict Morley sequence $(m_i : i < \omega)$ of $\mathrm{tp}(m/M)$ in M_1, with $m_0 = m$.

It easy to build such a model in ω steps: first fix a global coheir $\tilde{q}$ of $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$. Let $M^0 = M$, and having built M^k take M^{k+1} to satisfy $\bullet_2$, $\bullet_3$, where m is taken in M^k and move it so that $\mathrm{tp}(d/M^{k+1}) = \tilde{q}|M^{k+1}$. Then take the union.

Proposition 15. *Assume* T *is dp-minimal. Let* $M \prec M_1 \prec^+ N$, *and* $d \in N$ *as above. Let* $a_1, a_2 \in \mathfrak{U}$, $|a_1| = 1$, *such that* $p = \mathrm{tp}(a_1, a_2/N)$ *is* M*-invariant,* $\phi_0(a_1, a_2; d)$ *holds for some* $d \in N$ *and* $\mathrm{tp}(a_2/N)$ *commutes over* M_1 *with every coheir of* $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ *extending* $\mathrm{tp}(d/M_1)$.

Then there is $a_1' \in \mathfrak{U}$ *such that* $\phi_0(a_1', a_2; d)$ *holds,* $\mathrm{tp}(a_1', a_2/N)$ *is* M*-invariant and commutes over* M_1 *with every coheir of* $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ *extending* $\mathrm{tp}(d/M_1)$.

Proof. We say that the tuple $a_1{}^\frown a_2$ is Γ-good, when:

– $\Gamma = \{(\psi_\phi(x_1, x_2), \theta_\phi(x_2; d)) : \phi \in \Gamma_\phi\}$; where $\psi_\phi, \theta_\phi \in L(M_1)$;

– $\Gamma_\phi \subseteq L(M_1)$ and each $\phi \in \Gamma_\phi$ has the form $\phi(x_1, x_2; y)$;

– for each $\phi(x_1, x_2; y) \in \Gamma_\phi$, we have $\models \psi_\phi(a_1, a_2) \wedge \theta_\phi(a_2; d)$ and $\models (\forall x, y)(\psi_\phi(x, a_2) \wedge \theta_\phi(a_2; y) \rightarrow \phi(x, a_2; y))$.

Claim: If $a_1{}^\frown a_2$ is Γ-good, where $\Gamma_\phi = \{\phi \in L(M_1) : \phi = \phi(x_1, x_2; y) \in \mathrm{tp}(a_1, a_2, d/M_1)\}$, then $\mathrm{tp}(a_1, a_2/N)$ commutes over M_1 with every coheir of $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ extending $\mathrm{tp}(d/M_1)$.

We have to check condition (ii) of the Lemma 13. Let $\phi(x_1, x_2; y) \in L(M_1)$ such that $a_1{}^\frown a_2 \models \phi(x_1, x_2; d)$. By hypothesis on $\mathrm{tp}(a_2/N)$, and Lemma 13, there is $d\theta(y) \in \mathrm{tp}(d/M_1)$ such that for every $b \in M$, we have $d\theta(b) \rightarrow \theta_\phi(a_2; b)$. Then for each $b \in d\theta(M)$, we have $\models \phi(a_1, a_2; b)$. Hence the claim is proved.

Fix an enumeration of formulas in $L(M_1)$, of order type ω for which ϕ_0 is the first formula. Assume that we are given a_1, a_2 as in the statement and some Γ, Γ_ϕ finite, such that $a_1{}^\frown a_2$ is Γ-good. Let $\psi_*(x_1, x_2; g) \in L(M_1)$ be the conjunction of $\psi_\phi(x_1, x_2)$ for $\phi \in \Gamma_\phi$. If $a_1{}^\frown a_2$ commutes over M_1 with every coheir of $\operatorname{tp}(d/M)$ extending $\operatorname{tp}(d/M_1)$, we are done. Otherwise, there is such a coheir $\tilde{q}$ such that p does not commute with $\tilde{q}$. Let $I^\frown a_1 a_2{}^\frown b$ realise $\tilde{q}^\omega \otimes p \otimes \tilde{q}$ over N and set $\bar{b} = b + I$. Then $\bar{b}$ is indiscernible over $M_1 a_2$ (because $\operatorname{tp}(a_2/N)$ commutes with $\tilde{q}$ over M_1), but it is not indiscernible over $M_1 a_1 a_2$ by assumption.

Let $r \in S_y(M_1 a_2 \bar{b})$ be a type finitely satisfiable in M_1. If r is not weakly orthogonal to $\operatorname{tp}(a_1 a_2/M_1 a_2 \bar{b})$, then we contradict dp-minimality as in the proof of Theorem 10. Let $\phi(x_1, x_2; y)$ be the least formula in $L(M_1)$ which is not in Γ_ϕ and such that $\phi(a_1, a_2; d)$ holds. As usual, we find two formulas $\theta_0, \theta_1 \in L(M_1 a_2 \bar{b})$ and some $\psi(x_1, a_2; \bar{b}, e)$, $e \in M_1$ such that θ_0 and θ_1 cover the subset of $S_y(M_1 a_2 \bar{b})$ of types finitely satisfiable in M_1 and $\psi(x_1, a_2; \bar{b}, e) \wedge \theta_l(y) \to \phi^l(x_1, a_2; y)$. Write $\theta_l(y) = \theta_l(a_2, \bar{b}, e; y)$, $e \in M_1$.

Claim: We have $\models \theta_1(d)$.

We first show that $\operatorname{tp}(d/M_1 a_2 \bar{b})$ is finitely satisfiable in M_1. So let $\zeta(y; m_1, a_2, \bar{b}) \in \operatorname{tp}(d/M_1 a_2 \bar{b})$. By $\bullet_2$, there is $d' \in M_1$ such that $(m_1, d') \equiv_M (m_1, d)$. As $\operatorname{tp}(a_2, \bar{b}/N)$ is M-invariant, we have $d' \models \zeta(y; m_1, a_2, \bar{b})$ as required. It follows that one of $\theta_0(d)$ or $\theta_1(d)$ must hold. But since $\phi(a_1, a_2; d)$ holds, $\theta_0(d)$ cannot. So the claim is proved.

Let $(e_i, g_i : i < n) \in M_1$ be a sufficiently long strict Morley sequence over M with $(e_0, g_0) = (e, g)$. As $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/M_1 a_2)$ is finitely satisfiable in M, there is $\bar{b}' \in M$ satisfying:

- $(\exists x) \bigwedge_{i<n} \psi(x, a_2; \bar{b}', e_i) \wedge \psi_*(x, a_2; g_i)$;
- $(\forall x, y) \psi(x, a_2; \bar{b}', e) \wedge \theta_1(a_2; \bar{b}', e; y) \to \phi(x, a_2; y)$;
- $\theta_1(a_2; \bar{b}', e; d)$.

The first point implies that $\psi(x, a_2; \bar{b}', e) \wedge \psi_*(x, a_2; g)$ does not a_2-fork over M. So we can find a_1' realising that formula such that $\operatorname{tp}(a_1', a_2/N)$ is M-invariant.

Set $\Gamma_\phi' = \Gamma_\phi \cup \{\phi(x_1, x_2; y)\}$ and $\Gamma' = \Gamma \cup \{(\psi(x_1, x_2), \theta_1(x_2; d))\}$, then the pair $a_1'{}^\frown a_2$ is Γ'-good.

Now to prove the proposition, we iterate the above procedure. If we stop at some finite stage, we have what we want. If not, then we have defined a sequence a_1^k, $k < \omega$ of tuples and increasing sets Γ_k. Let $a_1' \in \mathfrak{U}$ be such that $\operatorname{tp}(a_1', a_2/N)$ is an accumulation point of $\operatorname{tp}(a_1^k, a_2/N)$. Then $a_1'{}^\frown a_2$ is Γ-good, where $\Gamma = \bigcup_{k<\omega} \Gamma_k$ and its type over N is M-invariant. Hence by the first claim, we are done. $\square$

Remark 16. Why do we bother with M_1? The problem is that to make sure that Γ increases throughout the construction, we need it to remain finite. So we can only deal with a countable set of parameters. This is the role of M_1: it controls a priori the parameters from ψ and θ_1.

Theorem 17. *Let* T *be dp-minimal. Let* $M \prec^+ N$, M *countable, and* $\phi(\bar{x}; d) \in L(N)$ *non-forking over* M. *Let* $M \prec M_1 \prec N$, *satisfying* $\bullet_0$ *through* $\bullet_3$.

Then there is $\bar{a} \in \mathfrak{U}$ *such that* $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}/N)$ *is* M*-invariant and commutes over* M_1 *with any coheir of* $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ *which extends* $\mathrm{tp}(d/M_1)$.

Proof. Write $\phi = \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n; d)$. Let $\bar{d} = (d_i : i < m)$ be a strict Morley sequence of $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ with $m > \mathrm{alt}(\phi)$. Let

$$\phi_1(x_1; \bar{d}) = (\exists x_2, \dots, x_n) \bigwedge_{i<m} \phi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n; d_i).$$

Then the formula $\phi_1(x_1; \bar{b})$ does not fork over M. Hence we can find $a_1 \in \phi_1(x_1; \bar{b})$ whose type over N is definable in M. Then the formula $\phi(a_1, x_2, \dots, x_n; \bar{b})$ does not a_1-fork over M, hence we may find $a_2, \dots, a_n \in \mathfrak{U}$ such that $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_n; d)$ holds and $\mathrm{tp}(a_1, \dots, a_n/N)$ is M-invariant.

Let $\phi_2(x_1, x_2; \bar{d}) = (\exists x_3, \dots, x_n) \bigwedge_{i<m} \phi(x_1, x_2, x_3, .., x_n; d_i)$. Then using the previous proposition, find a_2' such that $(a_1, a_2') \models \phi_2(x_1, x_2; \bar{d})$ and $\mathrm{tp}(a_1, a_2'/N)$ is M-invariant and commutes with every coheir of $\mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ extending $\mathrm{tp}(d/M_1)$. Then iterate. $\square$

7 Directionality

Recall that an NIP theory T is of *small directionality*, if given a model M and $p \in S(M)$, then for any finite set Δ of formulas, the global coheirs of p determine only finitely many Δ-types (and thus p has at most $2^{|T|}$ coheirs). It is of *medium directionality* if it is not of small directionality and if the global coheirs of every such p determine at most $|M|$ Δ-types (and thus p has at most $|M|^{|T|}$ coheirs).

Those notions are defined and investigated by Kaplan and Shelah in [KSa].

Assume that T is dp-minimal and of small or medium directionality.

Let M countable, $M \prec^+ N$ and $\phi(x;d) \in L(N)$ which does not fork over M. Let $Q \subset S_y(\mathcal{U})$ be a countable set of coheirs of $q = \text{tp}(d/M)$ such that for every finite Δ, and any coheir $\tilde{q}$ of q, there is $s \in Q$ such that $\tilde{q}$ and s have the same restriction to Δ-formulas. Let $\bar{d} = (d_s : s \in Q) \models \bigotimes_{s\in Q} s$ over M (the product being taken in any order). Find a model M_1 satisfying $\bullet_0$ through $\bullet_3$ for $\bar{d}$ instead of d and such that $\bar{d}$ realises $\bigotimes_{s\in Q} s$ over M_1.

Also, without loss, d is one of the d_s's.

Now, we apply the previous theorem with $\bar{d}$ instead of d (so $\bar{d}$ is not finite, but is countable. This does not change anything).

We obtain some $a \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\models \phi(a;d)$, tp(a/N) is M-invariant and commutes over M_1 with every coheir of tp(d/M) which extends some tp(d_s/M_1).

Claim: $p = \text{tp}(a/N)$ commutes over M with every coheir of tp(d/M).

Proof: Let $\tilde{q}$ be a coheir of tp(d/M) and $\phi(x;y) \in L(M)$ a formula. Assume that $p \vdash \phi(x;d)$. Let $s \in Q$ be such that s and $\tilde{q}$ have the same restriction to ϕ-formulas. Then p commutes with s, hence $s \vdash \phi(a;y)$, so $\tilde{q} \vdash \phi(a;y)$. As this is true for all ϕ, p commutes with q over M.

Hence we have proved:

Theorem 18. *If T is dp-minimal and of small or medium directionality, then Conjecture 3 holds.*

At this point one would hope that every dp-minimal theory is of small or medium directionality, but unfortunately this is not true. In fact RCF has large directionality (see [KSa]).

8 Amalgamation results in dependent theories

The results presented in this section are independent of the rest of the paper. They deal with amalgamating invariant types in NIP theories. Some of them were used in a previous, more complicated, proof of Theorem 10 and we hope that they might turn out to be useful elsewhere.

Contrary to many 3-amalgamation statements, for example in simple theories, here freeness is assumed only on two sides of the triangle.

Warning: Throughout this section, we assume that T is NIP.

Lemma 19. *Let $M \prec^+ N$ and let $p(x), q(y)$ be M-invariant types. Let $a \models p|_N$ and $b \models q|_N$, then there is some N-invariant type $r(x,y)$ extending $p(x) \cup q(y) \cup$ tp$(a,b/N)$.*

Proof. We know from Corollary 3.34 of [CK12] that any N-invariant consistent partial type is non-forking over M. Thus it is enough to show that $p(x) \cup q(y) \cup \text{tp}(a, b/N)$ is consistent. This is easy: any inconsistency can be dragged down in N by M-invariance of p and q. $\square$

Proposition 20. *Let* $M \prec^+ N$ *and let* p, q *be two global types finitely satisfiable in* M. *Let* $a \models p|_N$ *and* $b \models q|_N$, *then* $\text{tp}(a, b/N) \cup p \cup q$ *is finitely satisfiable in* N.

Proof. Otherwise, there is some $\theta(x; y) \in L(N)$, $\phi(x; c) \in L(\mathfrak{U})$ and $\psi(y; c) \in L(\mathfrak{U})$ such that $\phi(x; c) \wedge \psi(y; c) \wedge \theta(x; y)$ has no solution in N. Let $(\mathfrak{U}, N)$ denote the expansion of $\mathfrak{U}$ obtained by adding a unary predicate $\mathbf{P}(x)$ to name the submodel N. Let $(\mathfrak{U}, N) \prec^+ (\mathfrak{U}', N')$. By honest definitions ([Sim, 3.1]) we know that we can find two formulas $\phi'(x; c') \in L(N')$ and $\psi'(y; c') \in L(N')$ such that $\phi(N; c) \subseteq \phi'(N'; c') \subseteq \phi(N'; c)$ and same for ψ'. It follows that $\phi'(x; c') \wedge \psi'(y; c') \wedge \theta(x; y)$ has no solution in N', hence is inconsistent. As p is finitely satisfiable in N (indeed in M) and $p \vdash \phi(x; c)$, necessarily $p \vdash \phi'(x; c')$. Similarly, $q \vdash \psi'(x; c')$. Hence we conclude that $\theta(x; y) \wedge p(x) \wedge q(y)$ is inconsistent. But this contradicts Lemma 19. $\square$

The assumption that N is saturated over M is necessary to avoid situations such as the following: let $M = (\mathbb{Q}; <)$. Let $p(x)$ be the M-invariant global type defined by $p \vdash x < a \iff 0 < a$ and $p \vdash 0 < x$ and let $q(y)$ be similarly defined by $q \vdash y < a \iff 0 < r < a$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then we cannot amalgamate $p(x) \cup q(y) \cup x > y$.

Another situation where NIP allows us to amalgamate is when the types considered fit inside indiscernible sequences. This was observed in [Sim11a]. We recall (a special case of) Lemma 2.9 from that paper which will allow us to work over slightly more complicated bases at the expense of commutativity assumptions.

We need the following notation: if $I = (a_t : t \in \mathcal{I})$ is an indiscernible sequence, then $\lim(I/A)$ denotes the type $\lim(\text{tp}(a_t/A))$. Note that the limit exists by NIP.

Lemma 21. *Let* I_1, I_2, I_3 *be sequences of tuples, without endpoints. Assume that the concatenation* $I_1 + I_2 + I_3$ *is indiscernible over* A. *Let* $a, b \in \mathfrak{U}$ *such that* $I_1 + a + I_2 + I_3$ *and* $I_1 + I_2 + b + I_3$ *are indiscernible over* A. *Let* B *be any set of parameters. Then we can find* a', b' *such that* $a' \models \lim(I_1/B)$, $b' \models \lim(I_2/B)$ *and* $(a', b') \equiv_A (a, b)$.

Proof. See Lemma 2.9 of [Sim11a]. $\square$

Lemma 22. *Let* $I_1 + I_2$, $J_1 + J_2$ *be sequences mutually indiscernible over* A *(all sequences are endless). Let* a *and* b *such that* I_1+a+I_2 *and* J_1+J_2 *are mutually indiscernible over* A *and so are* $I_1 + I_2$ *and* $J_1 + b + J_2$. *Let* B *be any set of parameters. Then we can find* a', b' *such that* $a' \models \lim(I_1/B)$, $b' \models \lim(J_1/B)$ *and* $(a', b') \equiv_A (a, b)$.

Proof. We may assume that all the sequences considered have same order type as $\mathbb{R}$. Then we can write $I_1 = (a_t : t \in (0, 1))$, $I_2 = (a_t : t \in (1, 3))$, $J_1 = (b_t : t \in (0, 2))$ and $J_2 = (b_t : t \in (2, 3))$. For $l \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, let K_l be the sequence of pairs $\langle(a_t, b_t) : t \in (l, l + 1)\rangle$. By mutual indiscernibility, the sequence $K_1 + K_2 + K_3$ is indiscernible over A. Furthermore, we can find a_0 and b_0 such that $K_1 + (a, a_0) + K_2 + K_3$ and $K_1 + K_2 + (b_0, b) + K_3$ are indiscernible over A.

Now apply the previous lemma. $\square$

Proposition 23. *Let* $M \prec^+ N$. *Let* $p, q, r \in S(N)$ *be pairwise commuting* M*-invariant types. Let* $c \models r$, $a \models p|Nc$, $b \models q|Nc$. *Let* B *be any set containing* Nc. *Then we can find* a', b' *such that* $(a', b') \equiv_{Nc} (a, b)$, $a' \models p|B$ *and* $b' \models q|B$.

Proof. First, build a sequence I_1 such that $I_1 + a$ is a Morley sequence of p over Nc and I_1 is a Morley sequence of p over Ncb. To show that it is possible, fix some small $A \subset N$ containing M. Let $I_1^A \subset N$ be a Morley sequence of p over A. Then by the commuting assumptions, $I_1^A + a$ is a Morley sequence of p over Ac and I_1^A is a Morley sequence of p over Acb. We conclude by compactness.

Next, build similarly a sequence J_1 such that $J_1 + b$ is a Morley sequence of q over NI_1c and J_1 is a Morley sequence of q over NI_1ca. Finally, build I_2 (resp. J_2) a Morley sequence of p (resp. q) over everything, including B. Take the index set of those sequences to be without endpoints.

Then (using again the commutativity assumptions): $I_1 + I_2$ and $J_1 + J_2$ are mutually indiscernible over Nc and both $I_1 + a + I_2$ and $J_1 + b + J_2$ are indiscernible over Nc. Let I_1^* (resp. J_1^*) be the sequence I_1 (resp. J_1) indexed in the opposite order. By construction $\lim(I_1^*/B) = p|B$ and similarly for J_1. Thus we can apply the previous lemma to obtain what we want. $\square$

It seems possible that the commutativity assumptions can be somewhat relaxed.

Corollary 24. *Let* $(p_i : i < \alpha)$ *be a family of global invariant types. Assume that the* p_i*'s are pairwise orthogonal. Then* $\bigcup_{i<\alpha} p_i(x_i)$ *defines a complete type in the variables* $(x_i : i < \alpha)$*.*

Proof. Let κ be such that all types considered are invariant over a set of size $< \kappa$.

First assume that $\alpha = 3$. So let p, q, r three invariant types which are pairwise orthogonal. In particular, they pairwise commute. Let $a \models p$, $b \models q$ and $c \models r$. Let N be some κ-saturated model containing $\mathcal{U}c$. By Proposition 23, we can find a', b' such that $a' \models p|N$, $b' \models q|N$ and $(a', b') \equiv_{\mathcal{U}c} (a, b)$. By orthogonality of p and q, we have $(a, b) \models p \otimes q|N$. In particular $(a, b) \models p \otimes q|\mathcal{U}c$. and $(a, b, c) \models p \otimes q \otimes r$.

The general case follows by induction on α. $\square$

9 Open questions

We list here a few open problems. We adopt an optimistic presentation and state them as conjectures.

First, let us recall the central conjecture of this paper, which was first stated in [CS12a].

Conjecture 25. *Let* T *be NIP and* $M \models T$*. Let* $\phi(x; d) \in L(\mathcal{U})$ *a formula, non-forking over* M*. Then there is* $\theta(y) \in \mathrm{tp}(d/M)$ *such that the partial type* $\{\phi(x; d') : d' \in \theta(\mathcal{U})\}$ *is consistent.*

In dp-minimal theories, a stronger version seems plausible:

Conjecture 26. *Assume that* T *is dp-minimal. If the formula* $\phi(x; b)$ *does not fork over* M*, then it extends to an* M*-definable type.*

To prove the first conjecture for dp-minimal theories, using the methods above, it would be enough to establish the following:

Conjecture 27. *Let* T *be NIP (or dp-minimal),* $M \models T$ *countable. Let* $q \in S_y(M)$*. There there is a countable subset* $Q \subseteq S_y(\mathcal{U})$ *of coheirs of* q *such that for any invariant type* p*, if* p *commutes over* M *with all types in* Q*, then* p *commutes over* M *with any coheir of* q*.*

Invariant types

Returning to the initial problem which was mentioned in the introduction, we would like to analyse a general invariant type by a finitely satisfiable type and a definable 'quotient'. The following is a test question in that direction.

Conjecture 28. *Assume that* T *is NIP. Let* $M \prec^+ N$, $a \in \mathfrak{U}$ *such that* $\mathrm{tp}(a/N)$ *is* M*-invariant, and* $\phi(x;y) \in L(M)$. *Then there is* $b \in \mathfrak{U}$ *and a formula* $\psi(z;y)$ *such that* $\mathrm{tp}(b/N)$ *is finitely satisfiable in* M *and* $\phi(a;N) = \psi(b;N)$.

A positive answer to this conjecture, would imply a positive answer to the following:

Conjecture 29. *Let* $p(x)$ *be a global* M*-invariant type and* Δ *a finite set of formulas, then there is a finite set* Δ' *of formulas such that for any* $\phi(x;y) \in p$ *and* $b, b' \in \mathfrak{U}$, *if* $\mathrm{tp}_{\Delta'}(b/M) = \mathrm{tp}_{\Delta'}(b'/M)$, *then* $p \vdash \phi(x;b) \leftrightarrow \phi(x;b')$.

However, we cannot hope to be able in general to choose Δ' independently of p as the following example shows. Let $L = \{<; P_n : n < \omega\}$, where the P_n's are unary predicates. The theory T says that $<$ defines a dense linear order and the predicates P_n cut out distinct initial segments of it. For each n, we have a $\emptyset$-definable type p_n of an element satisfying P_n, but greater than all points in $P_n(\mathfrak{U})$.

Now take $\Delta = \{<\}$. Then the previous conjecture holds for p_n (and any choice of M) by taking $\Delta' = \{<, P_n\}$. However, for any Δ' in which P_n does not appear, we can find two elements b, b' having the same Δ'-type over M, such that b satisfies P_n but b' does not. Then we have $p \vdash x > b \wedge x < b'$.

Appendix

(written jointly with Sergei Starchenko.)

In this appendix, we show how the techniques presented above can be adapted to show a special case of Conjecture 26.

We will say that a theory T has property (D) if for every set A (of real elements) and consistent formula $\phi(x) \in L(A)$, with x a single variable, there is an A-definable complete type $p \in S_x(A)$ extending $\phi(x)$.

We emphasise that the type p might not extend to a global A-definable type.

Lemma 30. *Let* $M \prec N$ *and* $b \in \mathcal{U}$ *such that* $\mathrm{tp}(b/N)$ *is* M*-definable. Assume that* $p \in S_x(Mb)$ *is a complete* Mb*-definable type, then* p *extends to a complete type* $q \in S_x(Nb)$ *which is* Mb*-definable using the same definition scheme as* p*.*

Proof. For each formula $\phi(x; y, b) \in L(b)$, there is by hypothesis a formula $d\phi(y; b) \in L(M)$ such that for every $d \in M^{|y|}$ we have $p \vdash \phi(x; d, b)$ if and only if $\mathcal{U} \models d\phi(y; d, b)$. We have to check that the scheme $\phi(x; y, b) \mapsto d\phi(y; b)$ defines a consistent complete type over N. This follows at once from M-definability of $\mathrm{tp}(b/N)$. Let us check completeness for example. Assume that there is some $n \in N$ and formula $\phi(x; y, b)$ such that $\mathcal{U} \models \neg d\phi(n; b) \wedge \neg d(\phi^0)(n; b)$. Since $\mathrm{tp}(b/N)$ is an heir of $\mathrm{tp}(b/M)$, there must be such a tuple n in M, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Theorem 31. *Assume that* T *is dp-minimal and has property (D). Let* $M \models T$ *and* $\phi(x; d) \in L(\mathcal{U})$ *be non-forking over* M*. Then* $\phi(x; d)$ *extends to a complete* M*-definable type.*

Proof. The proof is an adaptation of the argument given for Proposition 11. We argue by induction on the length of the variable x. If $|x| = 1$, this follows from Theorem 10. Assume we know the result for $|x| = n$, and consider a non-forking formula $\phi(x_1, x_2; d)$, where $|x_2| = n$ and $|x_1| = 1$. Let $N \succ M$ sufficiently saturated, with $d \in N$. Using the induction hypothesis and by the argument given in the proof of Theorem 17, we can find a tuple $(a_1, a_2) \models \phi(x_1, x_2; d)$ such that $\mathrm{tp}(a_1, a_2/N)$ is M-invariant and $\mathrm{tp}(a_2/N)$ is definable (over M).

If $p = \mathrm{tp}(a_1, a_2/N)$ is definable we are done. Otherwise, there is some type $q \in S(N)$ finitely satisfiable in M such that p does not commute with q.

Now let $c \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $(a_1{}^\frown a_2, c) \models p \otimes q$. Let I be a Morley sequence of q over everything. As tp(a_2/N) is definable, it commutes with q. Therefore the sequence $\bar{c} = c + I$ is indiscernible over Na_2. However, it is not indiscernible over Na_1a_2. Take some $M \prec^+ N_1 \prec^+ N$ with tp(N_1/Md) finitely satisfiable in M. If $r \in S(Na_2\bar{c})$ is finitely satisfiable in N, then by the usual argument, r is weakly orthogonal to tp$(a_1/Na_2\bar{c})$.

Using compactness of the space of finitely satisifiable types, we obtain two formulas $\theta_0(y), \theta_1(y) \in L(Na_2\bar{c})$ such that:

$\mathcal{U} \models \theta_l(y) \to \phi^l(a_1, a_2; y)$ and for every $n \in N$, we have $\mathcal{U} \models \theta_0(n) \vee \theta_1(n)$.

Write $\theta_1(y)$ as $\theta_1(y; a_2, \bar{c}, e)$ exhibiting all parameters, with $e \in N$. By invariance of tp$(a_1, a_2, \bar{c}/N)$, we may assume that $e \in N_1$ and in particular tp(e/Md) is finitely satisfiable in M.

As tp$(\bar{c}/Na_2)$ is finitely satisfiable in M, there is $\bar{c}' \in M$ such that:

$$\models \theta_1(d; a_2, \bar{c}', e) \wedge (\exists x)(\forall y)(\theta_1(y; a_2, \bar{c}', e) \to \phi(x; y)).$$

Next, tp(e/Md) is finitely satisfiable in M. As tp(a_2/N) is M-definable, also tp(e/Mda_2) is finitely satisifiable in M and we may find $e' \in M$ such that the previous formula holds with e replaced by e'.

By property (D), there is some Ma_2-definable type $p_1(x_1)$ containing the formula $(\forall y)(\theta_1(y; a_2, \bar{c}', e') \to \phi(x; y))$. By Lemma 30, p_1 extends to a complete Ma_2-definable type over Na_2. Let a_1' realize that type. Then tp$(a_1', a_2/N)$ is M-definable and we have $\models \phi(a_1', a_2; d)$ as required. ☐

Theorem 31 was proved for *unpackable VC-minimal theories* by Cotter and Starchenko in [CS12b]. This class contains in particular o-minimal theories (for which the result was established earlier by Dolich [Dol04]) and C-minimal theories with infinite branching. We show now that our result generalises Cotter and Starchenko's and covers some new cases, in particular the field of p-adics.

Lemma 32. *Let* A *be any set of parameters and* $p(x)$ *be a global* acl(A)*-definable type. Then* $p|_A$ *is* A*-definable.*

Proof. Take $\phi(x; y) \in L$ and let $d\phi(y; a)$, $a \in$ acl(A), be the ϕ-definition of p. Then tp(a/A) is isolated by a formula $\phi(z) \in L(A)$. Define $D\phi(y) = (\exists z)\phi(z) \wedge d\phi(y; z)$. Then $D\phi(y)$ is a formula over A and defines the same set on A as $d\phi(y)$. ☐

Proposition 33. *The following classes of theories have property (D):*

- *theories with definable Skolem functions;*
- *dp-minimal linearly ordered theories;*
- *unpackable VC-minimal theories.*

Proof. Let T have definable Skolem functions and take a formula $\phi(x) \in L(A)$. Then we can find $a \in \mathrm{dcl}(A)$ such that $\models \phi(a)$, and thus $\mathrm{tp}(a/A)$ is as required.

Assume now that T is dp-minimal and that the language contains a binary symbol $<$ such that $\mathsf{T} \vdash$ "$x < y$ defines a linear order". Let $\phi(x) \in L(A)$ be a formula with $|x| = 1$. If the formula $\phi(x)$ contains a greatest element, then that element is definable from A, and we conclude as in the previous case. Otherwise, consider the following partial type over $\mathcal{U}$:

$$p_0 = \{a < x : a \in \phi(\mathcal{U})\} \cup \{x < b : \phi(\mathcal{U}) < b\} \cup \{\phi(x)\}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{P}$ be the set of completions of p_0. By Lemma 2.8 from [Sim11b], any $p \in \mathfrak{P}$ is definable over M. In particular, $\mathfrak{P}$ is bounded. Since $\mathfrak{P}$ is A-invariant (setwise), we conclude that every $p \in \mathfrak{P}$ is $\mathrm{acl}^{eq}(A)$-definable. Let p be such a type. Then by Lemma 32 $p|_A$ is A-definable.

Finally, let T be an unpackable VC-minimal theory. We will use results and terminology from [CS12b]. Let $\phi(x) \in L(A)$ be a consistent formula with $|x| = 1$. We work in T^{eq}. By the uniqueness of Swiss cheese decomposition, there is a consistent formula $\theta(x)$ over $\mathrm{acl}(A)$ that defines a Swiss cheese and $\models \theta(x) \to \phi(x)$. The outer ball B of $\theta(x)$ is definable over $\mathrm{acl}(A)$. The generic type the interior of B (see [CS12b, Definition 2.9]) is a global type definable over $\mathrm{acl}(A)$. Now use Lemma 32.

$\square$

Knowing that the theory of the p-adics has definable Skolem functions, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 34. *Let* $\mathsf{T} = \mathrm{Th}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ *and* $M \models \mathsf{T}$, *then any formula in* $L(\mathcal{U})$ *which does not fork over* M *extends to an* M*-definable type.*

References

[CK12] Artem Chernikov and Itay Kaplan. Forking and dividing in NTP_2 theories. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 77(1):1–20, 2012.

[CS12a] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. Externally definable sets and dependent pairs ii. Submitted, 2012.

[CS12b] Sarah Cotter and Sergei Starchenko. Forking in vc-minimal theories. Modnet preprint 354, 2012.

[Dol04] Alfred Dolich. Forking and independence in o-minimal theories. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 69(1):215–240, 2004.

[KOU12] Itay Kaplan, Alf Onshuus, and Alex Usvyatsov. Additivity of the dp-rank. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 2012.

[KSa] Itay Kaplan and Saharon Shelah. Examples in dependent theories. Preprint.

[KSb] Itay Kaplan and Pierre Simon. Witnessing dp-rank. Modnet preprint 414.

[Mat04] Jirí Matousek. Bounded vc-dimension implies a fractional helly theorem. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 31:251–255, 2004. 10.1007/s00454-003-2859-z.

[She10] Saharon Shelah. Dependent theories and the generic pair conjecture. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, submitted, 2010. math.LO/0702292.

[Sim] Pierre Simon. Lecture notes on nip theories. arXiv:1208.3944.

[Sim11a] Pierre Simon. Distal and non-distal theories. 2011.

[Sim11b] Pierre Simon. On dp-minimal ordered structures. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 76(4):448–460, 2011.